



Balserak, J. (2020). "The church that cannot err.": Early Reformed Thinking on the Church. In A. Vind (Ed.), *'Church' at the Time of the Reformation: Invisible Community, Visible Parish, Confession, Building...?* Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht (Göttingen).  
<https://www.eden.co.uk/christian-books/theological-studies/church-history/church-at-the-time-of-the-reformation-invisible-community-visible-parish-confession-building/>

Peer reviewed version

[Link to publication record in Explore Bristol Research](#)  
PDF-document

This is the author accepted manuscript (AAM). The final published version (version of record) is available online via Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht at <https://www.eden.co.uk/christian-books/theological-studies/church-history/church-at-the-time-of-the-reformation-invisible-community-visible-parish-confession-building/> . Please refer to any applicable terms of use of the publisher.

## University of Bristol - Explore Bristol Research

### General rights

This document is made available in accordance with publisher policies. Please cite only the published version using the reference above. Full terms of use are available:  
<http://www.bristol.ac.uk/red/research-policy/pure/user-guides/ebr-terms/>

## “The church that cannot err.” Early Reformed Thinking on the Church

Jon Balserak

It is a commonplace that the Reformed church is Augustinian. Yet though axiomatic, this might still be scrutinized. Ulrich Zwingli's use of Augustine in relation to the doctrine of the church is particularly open to scrutiny, as we shall see. A range of topics have occupied Zwingli scholarship, but this chapter will focus principally on his use of Augustine within his polemics; that is, his work of reforming the church in Zurich and the region. Given Zwingli's significance to the beginning of the Reformed church, our focus below will be upon him<sup>1</sup> and Zurich<sup>2</sup> though our purview will expand near the end of the essay.

### 1. The Reforming of the Church in Zurich

“The church that cannot err” (Zwingli: 1524, Bii). The phrase belongs to Zwingli, as we will discover. In fact, in 1523 it was something of a refrain for him, repeated on a number of occasions. He employs it particularly in debate, though it does eventually make its way into a more systematic work such as his *Commentarius de vera et falsa religione* (1525, 174; see 176-194 for his whole treatment of the church)

Zwingli had arrived in Zurich and been made Leutpriestertum (or, people's priest) in 1519. By that time, he had already been preaching elsewhere. He had been parish priest in Glarus and Einsiedeln. With his arrival in the city, he eschewed the standard lectionary of biblical readings, choosing rather to preach *lectio continua*—an indication of the biblical and reform-oriented direction in which he was headed. By this time he had already come to oppose pilgrimages and indulgences. Nor were these the only issues on his mind. On 9 March 1522, the well-known sausage eating incident in Froschauer's house took place, which demonstrated the direction of Zwingli's thinking as regards the idea of Christian freedom. The incident, which was dealt with relatively leniently by the city council, prompted concerns in other quarters. Additionally, in the summer of 1522, he petitioned the bishop of Constance concerning clerical celibacy. His claim was that the denial of marriage was driving priests into illicit acts and thus that it would be better if they could marry. This request was made more provocative when it was learned that Zwingli had himself actually married, Anna Reinhart (in 1522).<sup>3</sup>

By 1523, he had been in Zurich for four years. Two disputations would be held in Zurich that year. Zwingli's developing program had eventually won sufficient support of those on the city council that they called for a public disputation in order to, in effect, demonstrate the orthodoxy of what he and others like Jud were doing. It was scheduled for 23 Jan 1523. Zwingli prepared sixty-seven articles<sup>4</sup> which were to be the agenda for discussion. These articles read as ad hoc assertions quite specific (in many cases) to their specific historical context. They feature criticisms of the Roman church, specifically the mass, the

---

<sup>1</sup> While working on this chapter, I did not have access to *Sämtliche Werke* (1905-59), so accessed old copies of relevant writings of Zwingli via e-rara.

<sup>2</sup> Recent histories, see Thomas Lau (2012) and Gordon (2002).

<sup>3</sup> For an excellent new biography of Zwingli, see Opitz (2015). The best English biography of Zwingli is Potter (1976).

<sup>4</sup> In Zwingli's *Auslegen und Gründe der Schlussreden* (1523) published on 14 July, he filled out extensively the meaning of these sixty-seven articles.

pope, intercession of the saints, etc. These provide some sense of his thoughts on the contemporary church.

During this year of 1523, Zwingli wrote his treatise “An Essay on the Canon of the Mass (*De Canone Missae Huldrychi Zuinglii Epichiresis*)” in late August. There were many at the time who felt that they could not use the whole text of the standard mass book. Leo Jud had, in fact, in 1523 introduced a modified baptismal service in German. Accordingly, Zwingli wrote this to help them and to answer the criticisms that had been levelled against for doing this. November of 1523 saw an increase in acts of iconoclasm in the city, prompted, most people seemed to think, by the inflammatory preaching of Zwingli, Jud, Ludwig Hatzler, Johannes Stumpf and others. While much could be said about these events, they are indicative of the progress Zwingli and his colleagues were making.

This progress continued such that on April 11, 1525 Zwingli, Leo Jud, Kaspar Megander, Heinrich Engelhard, and Oswald Myconius petition the Zurich city council to abolish the mass. And not long after that, on Maundy Thursday in fact, they had the first Reformed celebration of the Lord’s Supper. They had already been accused of heresy and now were potentially guilty of schism.

## 2. The Church in Christian Thought

Charges of heresy and schism immediately carry us back into history. These are to Christian theology what the accusation of adultery is to marriage. They indicate the belief that a fundamental breakdown may be taking place.

Most of the standard creeds state that the church is “one, holy, catholic, and apostolic” (Schaff: 1990, 1: 28). Important here were texts like 1 Timothy 3: 15 that declares “the church is the pillar and ground of the truth.” Moreover, Jesus’ apparent declaration that he would build his church on Peter, the rock, (Matthew 16: 18) would seem to confirm the church’s authority and permanence (though there was debate about the identity of the rock to which Jesus referred). The Church of Rome claimed these texts were speaking of her. Others made similar claims. Accordingly, the Roman Church found herself continually having to defend herself from false teachers and schismatics, who set out rival versions of Christianity, which they insisted were the only true form of the faith (Ehrman: 2003).

Early responses to the problem of false teachers were numerous. In the second century, Irenaeus of Lyon spoke to the church’s handling of divergence from her truth in his *Adversus Haereticorum* in which he urged on the community of true Christians the importance of the *regula fidei*. (1857, II.27.2; II.41.4, etc) The Christian community holds fast to this rule against heretics and false prophets. It is known and adhered to only by those churches that were in a direct succession from the apostles. This, Irenaeus argued, is at once utterly reliable and denied by the heretic.

Tertullian also addressed the issue in his *De Praescriptione Haereticorum* and also employed the notion of the *regula fidei* when treating it (Tertullian: 1893, 12.5). Being particularly attuned to the fact that heretics pretend to be Christians but in reality accept only their own opinions, Tertullian proposed treating heretics by means of the prescriptions that were a part of Roman law according to which a plaintiff’s case could be thrown out of court. His tactic was to refuse to give a heretic the platform he desires to articulate his views.

In the fourth century, Vincent of Lerins produced another response to these problems. Witnessing the debates between Pelagius and Augustine, Vincent was prompted by these debates to produce his *Commonitories*, which he wrote under the pseudonym Peregrinus. In this work, he contended the church should distinguish orthodox teaching from innovation, by regarding the Catholic faith as consisting only of “what has been believed everywhere,

always, and by all (*quod ubique, quod semper, quod ab omnibus creditum est*)” (Vincent: 1915, II.3).

Augustine also addressed these concerns. His approach to false teachers was more diffuse and cannot be identified by reference to just one writing, but was nonetheless extremely significant. One important aspect of his approach related to his views on predestination and the doctrine of the church. For Augustine, God’s secret predestination was apologetically helpful. Through the doctrine of predestination, Augustine could acknowledge that not all the elect were in the Roman Church at present. This concession could be made by him without requiring him to give up belief in the singular authority of the Roman Catholic Church. It could be the case that some of the elect were, at present, outside of the Roman fellowship, but even though that was true, Augustine could still insist (in, for instance, *de Baptismo*) that the Roman Church was the only place in which salvation was to be found. “[I]t is the church that gives birth to all” (Augustine: 1841, 1.15-23 cited by Pelikan: 1971, 303). The Roman Catholic Church was, as he said time and time again, the church that was established through the performing of miracles through which God testified that this was *his* church. Augustine’s famous words about how he would not have been moved to believe the gospel had it not been for the testimony to it by the Catholic Church offers more evidence as to the character of Augustine’s ecclesiology.

Of these, Vincent’s approach is arguably the most conservative. Pursuing, as it did, a kind of *via media* between (what he perceived to be) the excesses of Pelagianism and Augustinianism (and especially that of Augustinianism, since the condemnation of Pelagius would have drastically reduced his impact upon subsequent Christian theology), Vincent’s approach sought to shut-out doctrinal novelty. Yet though sophisticated, Vincent’s solution still left unanswered questions. How does the church apply the Vincentian Canon? By papal decision? By council? Who decides what has been believed by everyone, all the time, everywhere? In other words, how ought one to understand the idea of authority?

Key to this question of authority is the issue of sources. While Vincent may appear *prima facie* to handle the problem of novelty by means of an extra-biblical tradition which was to serve as a separate source and complement the biblical record, a closer reading suggests the opposite. Here I agree with Heiko Oberman’s assertion that Vincent did not want “the interpretation of the Church, ... to become a second tradition or source apart from Holy Scripture” (Oberman: 1986, 280). Rather, following the Vincentian canon would likely ensure that no second source was created. For him tradition would seem to have simply represented the living interpretation of the source of the sacred scriptures.

In this regard, the solutions offered by Irenaeus, Tertullian, and Augustine was perhaps more straightforward. They placed authority in the Roman fellowship which embraced the *regula fidei*, and while they clearly possessed profound reverence for the sacred scriptures, they also acknowledged, with varying degrees of clarity, tradition as a separate source of authority. Understanding of the content of this tradition was placed solely in the hands of the Roman Catholic Church.

### 3. Defending the Church in the Middle Ages

While thinking on the church continued into the Middle Ages, the authority of the patristic authors meant that their methods for handling false teachers would have an enormous influence on this period. As the church met with various false teachers, these heretics would sometimes embrace ancient heresies, like Docetism, Donatism, Arianism, Novatianism, Montanism, Sabellianism, or Marcionism. Others concentrated “on the institutions and practices of catholic Christianity rather than on its dogma,” but did nonetheless “diverge from

the church in some fundamental doctrinal ways” (Pelikan: 1978, 3: 236). The premier example Pelikan points to in order to illustrate his point is that of the Cathari.

Heresy was rarely simple to define and prosecute. Nor did it help that the church frequently suffered from its own internal moral, institutional, and doctrinal problems. There were problems like those about which Peter Damian complained in his *Liber Gomorrhianus* (PL 145: 159–90), which attacked the problem of clerical homosexuality in the eleventh century. The huge problems into which the institutional church fell with the Avignon papacy may also be mentioned here—problems which had undoubted ramifications on subsequent centuries.

Additionally, the church did not always find the work of interpreting her own tradition easy or even (at times) possible. This is perfectly illustrated by Peter Abelard’s *Sic et Non* (1076–77), in which the Frenchman demonstrates and attempts to develop rules for handling apparent disagreements between patristic authors. Naturally, the difficulty the church faced in this analysis (of these patristic authorities) only added to the complexity of her efforts to condemn heretics and censure schismatics.

Prompted by such internal issues, some theologians began asking. “What is the church of God, and where is it, and why is it? (PL 192: 1294 cited by Pelikan: 1978, 236), as Hugh of Amiens, the twelfth century French Benedictine queried. Joined with such questions was a concern for the unity of the Christian church. Being attacked from without and troubled from within, the Christian church became more reflective. This reflection would continue well into the Early Modern era and in some senses has never stopped. Accordingly Dietrich of Nieheim, the fifteenth-century historian of the western schism, asked precisely the same questions raised by Hugh, querying also why it was necessary to work for the union of the universal church if in fact that church has always been undivided and unified.

At the commencement of the fourteenth century, Pope Boniface VIII confidently mentioning the creedal declaration of the church as one, holy, catholic and apostolic in *Unam Sanctam* (1881, 1245). An explanation of the meaning of those four identifiers was not produced by Boniface. He, head of the church, spoke with the authority ascribed to him (he believed) by Christ in Matthew 16. It was, I might suggest, a statement out of line with the uncertainty that was about to visit the church over the next several hundred years.

The fourteenth century would also witness the aforementioned Avignon Papacy and the start of the Italian Renaissance. Both would have a profound impact on thinking on the church. Part of the fruit of the Renaissance was the rediscovery of ancient writings, among which those of Aurelius Augustine shined as of profound significance. Indeed, this is apparent in the father of the Renaissance, Petrarch, whose love of Augustine is well-known. This rejuvenation of Augustinianism can also be seen in the theology of individuals like Gregory of Rimini and Thomas Bradwardine. The latter’s treatise *De causa Dei* (1313), appearing roughly forty years after *Unam Sanctam*, would contribute to a vigorous retrieval of Augustine’s thought and influence figures like John Wyclif who, in turn, would influence Jan Hus.

This retrieval of Augustine was, at least in some quarters, a vigorous and thoroughgoing rejuvenation of his thought, with impressive adaptations made to suit the late-medieval context. One place this can be seen is in the doctrine of the church. The *de ecclesia* locus had received no special attention from major thirteenth century figures like Peter Lombard in his *Sentences* or Thomas Aquinas’ *Summa Theologica* (which does not contain a set of questions on the subject).<sup>5</sup> Yet, by the fourteenth century this would change.

Jan Hus would, in his *De Ecclesia*, engage in some quite-impressive adapting of Augustinian themes which he applied to the church. The church, he insisted, consists of the

---

<sup>5</sup> For Aquinas on the church, see Sabra (1987).

“totality of all who have been predestined” (1956, 1.B). Likewise Hus, following John Wyclif (1894, 5: 408-9), insisted that the church being referred to in Matthew 16, where Jesus declared that he would build his church on Peter, was not the Roman Catholic Church (nor was the rock referred to in the text actually Peter). It was, rather, “the gathering of the predestined” (1956, 7.B-C).

For Hus and Wyclif (and as we shall see, Zwingli) to talk confidently *in this context* about the gathering of the predestined carried considerable weight because of Augustine’s authority. Yet to some it was not a welcome re-assertion of an authoritative church father, because of the polemical usage to which they put this Augustinian emphasis. Some within the Roman Church found their usage of predestination profoundly worrying. So, when Hus declared that the only church deserving of obedience was the church which contained the predestined and morally upright and not the Roman Catholic church, he was, Jean Gerson insisted, destroying “all certainty about the church and with it all ability to function in the church” (1960-73, 2: 164, Epistle 35). Even some of the Hussites agreed that such a distinction, based as it was on defining the church exclusively as the company of the predestined, was ultimately unworkable.

So, did men like Gerson simply oppose the theology of Augustine? That is of course a possibility. But irrespective of the answer given to that question, Gerson’s concerns raise a larger problem related to the use being made of Augustine.

#### 4. Reformed thinking on the Church: A New Augustinianism

Returning now to Zwingli, we will investigate his appropriation of predestination in his polemics against the Roman Catholic Church. Of the disputations in which Zwingli was involved, we will first take up two that occurred between 1523 and 1524, leading up to his petitioning (along with Jud, Myconius, et al.) of the Zurich city council in the spring of 1525 to abolish the mass.

Zwingli took part in a disputation with the Roman Catholic authorities in Zurich which opened on 29 January 1523. By the end of 1522 the circumstances were too troubling to continue without some resolution on a number of affairs. Zwingli had been denounced as a heretic. Zurich was accused because of their tolerating of his provocative sermons. The disputation called to settle these matters was not to be an academic debate. The bishop and representatives of the diocese were to put the opposing case but also to listen, advise and mediate. From Constance Johannes Fabri, the vicar-general of the diocese was sent. But no doctors of the church were present and the debate was held in the vernacular. The second disputation we will examine was Zwingli’s written argument with Jerome Emser. In response to Zwingli’s *Epichiresis* on the Canon of the Mass (1523) Jerome Emser wrote *Canonis Missae contra Huldricum Zuinglium Defensio* in 1524. Zwingli responded to that with *Adversus Hieronymum Emserum canonis missae adsertorem Huldrychi Zuinglii antibolon*, which contains five sections, one of which is on the church.

In the first disputation, Zwingli came up against unprepared disputants. Their remit was non-aggressive. The people were to decide the winner. At one point, one of the representatives of the diocese urged Zwingli to submit to the authority of the church, as the councils and papal decisions have been invested with divine authority. “The church,” Zwingli was told, “cannot err” (1901, 83-4). To this, Zwingli—after complaining about the errors which indisputably had been produced by pope and council, declared:

But when he declares the Church has decreed such and such, and she cannot err, I ask what is meant by “Church?” (1901, 85)

Here is a nice reiteration of the question asked by Hugh of Amiens, Dietrich of Nieheim, and (implicitly) by Pope Boniface VIII and, after a certain fashion, by Irenaeus, Tertullian, Vincent, and Augustine in an earlier age. Now all of them—but particular for our purposes, Augustine—would have surely answered this within a polemic context by clarifying that the Roman Catholic Church was what we mean by “Church.” Zwingli, however, took a very different tact.

Continuing, he queried whether what was meant was “the pope at Rome, with his tyrannical power and the pomp of cardinals and bishops ...”? (1901, 85) He asserted that this church “has often gone wrong and erred, as everyone knows” (1901, 85). He then countered: “there is another Church which the popes do not wish to recognize,” adding a moment later that “[t]hat Church cannot err” (1901, 85). And Zwingli said precisely the same thing in his response to Emser’s defence in their written disputation. “There is, therefore, another kind of church ... (*Est igitur alterum Ecclesiae Genus, ...*)” (1524, n.p.).

What becomes clear as one examines these Zwinglian utterances, is that he is identifying the gathering of the predestined as the church that cannot err. In other words, in both these disputes with representatives of Roman Catholicism, Zwingli used Augustine’s emphasis on predestination towards the end of seeking to acknowledge the authority of the church of Jesus Christ but to find it *outside* of the Roman fellowship.

That Zwingli had in mind the elect alone when he was speaking about the church becomes apparent when we see that Zwingli, at one point, complained that some insist that such a church can no more exist than can Plato’s Republic (1524, n.p.).<sup>6</sup> Moreover he spoke in other places, such as in his *Auslegen und Gründe der Schlussreden* (1523) and *Fidei Ratio* (1530) of the church as consisting only of the predestined. It is a common theme in his ecclesiology.

As he proceeded, Zwingli plainly identified himself and his fellow believers (that is, the fledgling Reformed church) as that church; the church that cannot err; *his* church that would enjoy a Reformed celebration of the Lord’s Supper on April 13, 1525. What he explicitly said about the true church—this other church that the Popes do not want to recognize—is worth paying attention as well. In both disputations, he identified it with Paul’s words in Ephesians 5: 25-27, where Paul says that Christ gave himself for the church so that he might sanctify her, presenting her to himself without spot or wrinkle. He explained his views on it further by saying that this church:

... is no other than all right Christians, collected in the name of the Holy Spirit and by the will of God, which have placed a firm belief and unhesitating hope in God, her spouse. ... That Church cannot err. Cause: she does nothing according to her own will or what she thinks fit, but seeks only what the spirit of God demands, calls for and decrees. (1901, 85)

Thus, Zwingli has followed a Hussite path (though surely not self-consciously<sup>7</sup>) in his appropriating of this Augustinian notion of predestination in relation to the church and argued, in effect, that he and his co-religionists owed honor and obedience to *this* church and *not* to the Roman Church.

His approach is severely scrutinized in a later dispute in which Zwingli was involved. He faced a more-theologically-astute interlocutor than either Johannes Fabri or Jerome Emser when he came up against Johan Eck, who produced *Repulsio Articulorum Zvvinglii C[a]es.*

---

<sup>6</sup> This Plato’s Republic criticism was first raised by Thomas Murner, as is noted by Schreiner (2011, 177).

<sup>7</sup> Zwingli’s indebtedness to Augustine is well-attested (see for instance, Stephens: 1986, 17-21). His indebtedness to Hus and Wyclif, though often proposed, is extremely doubtful (see Potter: 1976, 63).

*Maiestati oblatorum* in 1530 to refute Zwingli's *Fidei Ratio*. As Susan Schreiner summarizes, Eck was essentially asking Zwingli, "How could a person identify a church that consists of inward faith and is known to God alone?" (2011, 180). Indeed, Eck was hugely critical of Zwingli's manner of speaking about the church, in particular his assertion that the church is the gathered elect. "It is," Eck said, "a damnable error to teach that the church consists only of the predestined" (1530, 36r). Eck mocked Zwingli for contending that the church is known to God alone but also that it is somehow also known "to the Zwingli saintlings (*sanctulis*)" (1530, 37v). And when Zwingli acknowledged that there are other meanings of the word "church"—which he did do (e.g. 1524, n.p.),<sup>8</sup> including the idea that it can refer universally to everyone who has professed faith in Christ—Eck lambasted him for his duplicity. Eck also challenged Zwingli that if he were willing to concede the legitimacy of this designation for the word "church," then he should at once acknowledge that this sense of the word is "really the proper one" (1530, 38r), and so he should stop insisting on speaking about the church as consisting only of the elect.

The force of Eck's complaints highlights the difference between Augustine's use of predestination and Zwingli's use of it. Augustine acknowledged the existence of members of the elect who were presently outside of the Roman Church, but that was all he did; all he needed to do. He did not need to say anything about them or, more importantly, to identify them. He only needed to explain that they had a real existence; that there were currently members of the elect who were outside of the Roman Church, but who would eventually come into it (since it "gives birth to all" (Augustine: 1841, 1.15-23)). Zwingli, however, attempted to do precisely the opposite. He attempted to identify the elect who were outside of the Roman Catholic Church, and say that they actually constituted the true church. In point of fact, some Reformed theologians would turn Augustine's argument completely on its head by arguing that there were members of the elect within the Roman Catholic Church who would eventually come out of it and into the Reformed fellowship.

This difference raises some interesting questions. It broaches the concern voiced by Joachim Westphal that heretics like Zwingli and the Zwinglians lacked sufficiently-deep knowledge of Augustine (1555, 7r as cited by Visser: 2011, 84).<sup>9</sup> It also raises the already-mentioned concern articulated by Jean Gerson against Hus, namely, that by speaking about the church in the way he did, Zwingli was destroying "all certainty about the church and with it all ability to function in the church" (1960-73, 2: 164, Epistle 35). Indeed, the similarities between Hus and Zwingli here are undeniable.

But perhaps most significantly, the difference reveals something about the character of early Reformed thinking on the church. Zwingli saw himself and his colleagues as chosen by God and faithful to God's word. Part of that faithfulness seems to have issued precisely from the fact that they were a *different church* from the (corrupt) Church of Rome. Here I acknowledge what Locher argues (2004, 57), namely, that Zwingli can (albeit rarely) treat the Roman Church simply as one of the congregations that make up the earthly church—but contend that the vast majority of his polemic work functions on the idea that the Roman

---

<sup>8</sup> There is a discussion in Locher (2004, 57) about whether, or not, Zwingli identifies three senses of the word, "church" There Locher argues that while Rohls (1987, 205), Stephens (1986, 263) and Locher himself (1979, 218) all contend that Zwingli does set out three senses—one, the church universal "including even unbelievers and hypocrites," two, the "community of the saints according to the *apostolicum*," and three, the "single parish"—the vast majority of the time, Zwingli discusses only two senses. He can alternate between which two, but he usually discusses only two. Whether Locher is correct (and I would argue that he is), it is clear to any who read Zwingli's *Fidei Ratio* that he discusses three senses there, which Eck attacks mercilessly (1530, 36r-40r). For an important attempt to work out different phases in Zwingli's understanding of the church, see Alfred Farner (1930, 3-6).

<sup>9</sup> Here I am not questioning specifically which writings of Augustine Zwingli may have read (on which see Backus: 1996, 2: 627-660) but rather how deep his understanding of Augustine and the patristic era was.



Church is effectively a false church. A second part of that faithfulness seems to have been found in a kind of perfectionism which Zwingli associated with the true church. In his polemic against Rome, he lambasts the Roman Church as having “often gone wrong and erred, as everyone knows” (1901, 85). He furthermore contends of the true church (which Rome did not wish to recognize) that he and his colleagues do not err; they “[do] nothing according to her own will or what she thinks fit, but seeks only what the spirit of God demands, calls for and decrees,” as he declared (1901, 86). These linked sentiments are at the heart of Zwingli’s thinking on the church. Third, by narrowing the church so much, Zwingli and his co-religionists would seem to run the risk of contradicting various scriptural passages that speak of the church in this present life as a mixed body (which is, incidentally, another Augustinian emphasis). The church, insisted Eck, is not flawless in this life, and yet Zwingli has the audacity to “set up a church without spot or wrinkle made up of his saintlings” (1530, 37r). Zwingli, of course, conceded the point Eck was pressing on him, yet the drift of his thought ran along different lines—it was fundamentally polemic in character.

And the same three points are also applicable, to a greater or lesser degree, to many of those who followed Zwingli within Reformed thought. Similar emphases can be seen in the *First Helvetic Confession* of 1536 (written by Heinrich Bullinger, Jud, Myconius and others) and Leo Jud’s *Catechismus* of 1539, the locus on the church produced by Peter Martyr Vermigli, John Calvin’s *Institutio Christianae Religionis* (1559), Wolfgang Musculus’s *Loci Communes* (1560), and Bullinger’s *Decades* and his *Second Helvetic Confession* (1566). Even if we move geographically further afield, the *Heidelberg Catechism* (1563) conveys something of these emphases as well.

## 5. Concluding Reflections

Zwingli’s identifying of the “church that cannot err” with the number of the predestined, while predicated on an Augustinian understanding of the church, would appear to diverge in ways from the North African’s ecclesiology. A more thorough analysis of this issue would need to be taken up before a definitive judgment on it can be made. This short chapter has only been able to highlight the subject and raise questions about it. It should, of course, be acknowledged that Augustine and Zwingli worked within profoundly different polemical circumstances. The extent to which this explains any apparent differences between them is difficult, at this point, to comment on.

## 6. Bibliography

ABELARD, PETER (1976-77), *Sic et Non*. Eds Blanche Boyer and Richard McKeon. Chicago: University of Chicago.

AUGUSTINE (1865), *De Baptismo contra Donatistas libri VII*, in: PL 43: 107-143.

BACKUS, IRENA (1996), “Ulrich Zwingli, Martin Bucer, and the Church Fathers,” in: *The Reception of the Church Fathers in the West: From the Carolingians to the. Maurists*, Irena Backus (ed.), 2 vols, Leiden: Brill, 2: 627-660.

BRADWARDINE, THOMAS (2013), *Thomas Bradwardine: De causa Dei contra Pelagium et de virtute causarum*, Anna Lukács (ed.), Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

BULLINGER, HEINRICH (1552), *Sermonum Decades quinque*. Zurich: C. Froschauer.

CALVIN, JOHN (1559), *Institutio christianae religionis, in libros quatuor nunc primum digesta, certisque distincta capitibus, ad aptissimam methodum: aucta etiam tam ... opus novum haberi possit*. Geneva: Robertus Stephanus.

DAMIAN, PETER (1853), *Liber Gomorrhianus*, in: PL 145: 159-90.

DIETRICH OF NIEHEIM (1697), *De modis uniendiae reformandi ecclesiam and De difficultate reformationis in concilia universali*, Hermann von der Hardt (ed.), in: *Concilium*, 1, 68-142.

ECK, JOHANNES (1530), *Repulsio Articulorum Zwinglii C[arolus] Maiestati oblatorum* Augsburg: s.n.

EHRMAN, BART (2003), *The Battles for Scripture and the Faiths We Never Knew*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

EMSER, JEROME (1524). *Canonis Missae contra Huldricum Zuinglium Defensio*, Leipzig: s.n.

FARNER, ALFRED (1930), *Die Lehre von Kirche und Stadt bei Zwingli*, Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr.

GERSON, JEAN (1960-73), *Oeuvres complètes*, Palémon Glorieux (ed.), 10 vols. Paris: Desclée.

GORDON, BRUCE (2002), *The Swiss Reformation*, Manchester: Manchester University Press.

HAUSER, M. (1994), *Prophet und Bischof: Huldrych Zwingli's Amtsverständnis im Rahmen der Zürcher Reformation*, Freiburg (Schweiz): Universitätsverlag.

HUS, JAN (1956), *Magistri Johannis Hus Tractatus de Ecclesia*. Cambridge: University of Cambridge.

HUGH OF AMIENS (1855), *Contra hereticos sui temporis sive de Ecclesia et eius ministris*, in: PL 192: 1141-1352.

IRENÆUS (1857), *Adversus Haereticorum*. Cantabrigiae: Typis academicis.

LEO, JUD (1539), *Brevissima christianae religionis formula ... utilitatem excusa*, Zurich: C. Froschauer.

LAU, THOMAS (2012), *Kleine Geschichte Zürichs*, Regensburg: Pustet.

LEY, ROGER (1948). *Kirchenzucht bei Zwingli*. Zurich: Zwingli-Verlag.

LOCHER, GOTTFRIED WILHELM (1979), *Die Zwinglische Reformation im Rahmen der europäischen Kirchengeschichte*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

LOCHER, GOTTFRIED WILHELM (2004), *Sign of the Advent; A Study in Protestant Ecclesiology*, Fribourg: Academic Press.

LOCHER, GOTTFRIED WILHELM (2004), *Sign of the advent: from the ecclesia invisibilis to the visible spiritual community*, in: *Internationale kirchliche Zeitschrift: neue Folge der Revue internationale de théologie* 94, 156-187

OBERMAN, HEIKO (1986), *The Dawn of the Reformation*; Edinburgh. T&T Clark.

OPITZ, PETER (2015), *Ulrich Zwingli: Prophet, Ketzer, Pionier des Protestantismus*. Zurich: TVZ.

PELIKAN, JAROSLAV (1971-1989), *The Christian Tradition*, 5 vols, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

MUSCULUS, WOLFGANG (1564), *Loci Communes*, Basel: Joannem hervagium.

POPE BONIFACE VIII (1881), *The bull Unam Sanctam (November 1302)*, in: *Corpus Iuris Canonici*, II. Leipzig: Bernhard Tauchnitz, col. 1245-46.

POTTER, G.R. (1976). *Zwingli*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

ROHLS, J. (1987), *Theologie reformierter Bekenntnisschriften: von Zürich bis Barmen*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

SABRA, GEORGE (1987), *Thomas Aquinas' Vision of the Church*, Mainz: Matthias-Grünwald-Verlag.

SCHAFF, PHILIP (1990) *Creeds of Christendom; with a history and critical notes* Grand Rapids: Baker.

SCHREINER, SUSAN (2011), *Are You Alone Wise? The Search for Certainty in the Early Modern Era*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

STEPHENS, PETER (1986), *The Theology of Huldrych Zwingli*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

TERTULLIAN (1893), *De Praescriptione Haereticorum ad martyras*, Oxford: Clarendon press.

VERMIGLI, PETER MARTYR (1580), *loci Communes*, Robert Masson (ed.) Zurich: C. Froschauer.

VINCENT OF LIRENS (1915), *Commonitorium*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

VISSER, ARNOUD S.Q. (2011), *Reading Augustine in the Reformation; The Flexibility of Intellectual Authority in Europe, 1500-1620*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

WESTPHAL, JOACHIM (1555), *Collectanae sententiarum divi Aurelii Augustini Episcopi Hipponensis de Coena Domini ...* Regensburg: Joannis Carbo.

WYCLIF, JOHN (1883-1914), Wycliffe's Latin Works, 35 vols, London: The Wycliffe Society.

ZWINGLI, ULRICH (1523), *Canone Missae Huldrychi Zuinglii Epichiresis*, Zurich: C. Froschouer.

ZWINGLI, ULRICH (1523), *Auslegen und Gründe der Schlussreden*, Zurich: C. Froschouer.

ZWINGLI, ULRICH (1523), *De Canone Missae Huldrychi Zuinglii Epichiresis*, Zurich: C. Froschouer.

ZWINGLI, ULRICH (1524), *Adversus Hieronymum Emserum canonis missae adsertorem Huldrychi Zuinglii antibolon*. Zurich: C. Froschouer.

ZWINGLI, ULRICH (1525), *Commentarius de vera et falsa religione*, Zurich: C. Froschouer.

ZWINGLI, ULRICH (1530), *Ad Carolum Romanorum imperatorem Germaniae comitia Augustae celebrantem fidei Huldrychi Zwinglij Ratio. ...* Zurich: C. Froschouer.

ZWINGLI, ULRICH (1901), *Selected works of Huldreich Zwingli (1484-1531) ... ser.2 v.1.* Zwingli, Ulrich, 1484-1531, Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

ZWINGLI, ULRICH (1905-1959), *Sämtliche Werke*. Emil Egli, Georg Finsler, and Walther Köhler (ed.), Berlin: Schwetschke.